

## **BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES**

**June 24, 1999**

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Lemon called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Walter Lemon; Board Members Stewart Straus, Renee Cannon, and Alissa Crane. David Williams and Hal Beighley were excused.

Staff was represented by Development Services Manager Irish Bunnell, Senior Planner John Osterberg, Associate Planner Colin Cooper, and Recording Secretary Gerry Bowles.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **Continuances**

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Chairman Lemon opened the public hearing and read the format for the meeting. He indicated that his employer is involved in both the Southridge High School and the Beaverton Library projects. He will not be participating in either hearing. Board Member Renee Cannon will assume the duties as Chairman for those two items. There were no other disqualifications of Board members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board member to hear any of the agenda items.

**A. BDR 98097/VAR 98009 – PRECISION AUTO BUILDING ADDITION**  
***(Request for continuance to July 22, 1999)***

Request for Design Review approval to construct an approximately 8,732 square foot secondary building at the existing Precision Auto site. The building proposes ten automobile bays in which additional off-street parking is being proposed to allow for the increased parking requirements. A Design Variance is also being requested to reduce the required rear setback from 20 feet to 9 feet. The General Commercial Zoning District requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for “Automotive Services, Major”.

Since the use received a CUP approval in 1979, the proposed expansion would require an administrative CUP. The applicant has included an Administrative Conditional Use Permit and it will be reviewed administratively. Therefore, no public hearing regarding the Conditional Use Permit will be held unless the decision is appealed. The site is within the General Commercial (GC) zone. The site is located south of SW Carousel Court, west of SW 141<sup>st</sup> Avenue, north of SW Tualatin Valley Highway, east of SW 144<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and is approximately 1.08 acres in size. Map 1S1-9CC; Tax Lot 3200.

Mr. Straus MOVED and Ms. Cannon SECONDED a motion to continue BDR 98097/VAR 98009 Precision Auto Building Addition until July 22, 1999. The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

**B      VAR 99-00011/VAR 99-00013/VAR 99-00014/VAR 99-00015 –**  
**SOUTHRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL VARIANCES**  
*(Continued from June 10, 1999)*

Request for approval to install six signs on the Southridge High School campus. Because one sign is permitted for authorized non-residential uses in a residential zone, placement of the five additional signs requires a variance. The proposal includes three monument signs along the east edge of the property fronting SW 125<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a wall sign above the main entrance to the high school, a wall sign on the east elevation of the gymnasium, and a scoreboard located on the football field. The face of the scoreboard is proposed to be visible only from the east. The applicant also requests approval of three variances to exceed the 32-square foot maximum size for three of the proposed signs. In addition, the applicant requests variance approval for the sign height of the football scoreboard. The site is within the Residential Urban Standard Density (R-7) zone. The site is located at 9625 SW 125<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and is approximately 32.74 acres in size. Map 1S1-28DD; Tax Lot 300.

Ms. Cannon assumed the duties as Chairman.

Mr. Osterberg corrected the staff report pertaining to Sign 5 to read VAR 99-000015. Also, the agenda includes a VAR 99-00016. It was determined that this sign met Code requirements and there was no need for a variance application for this sign. The procedure to be followed for the hearing was discussed and it was decided that testimony on all the signs would be heard rather than hearing them individually. Mr. Osterberg presented the staff reports for all the sign variances. Staff is recommending denial of Signs 1, 3, and 4 and approval of Sign 5.

Ms. Cannon asked if all the lines shown on the diagram for the message board sign can accommodate lettering. Mr. Osterberg said this was his understanding but asked that the applicant clarify how many lines of letters can be accommodated on that sign. This sign is a reader board using interchangeable letters.

JACK ORCHARD, 1100 One Main Place, 101 SW Main, Portland 97204, representing Beaverton School District, said a main entry wall sign and a message board sign are virtually utilized at every school in the Beaverton School District, including elementary and middle schools. This is the first high school being constructed in the City of Beaverton in almost 100 years. The other three high schools received their approval through Washington County. Signage varies, however, basic signage for high schools certainly includes a main entry lettering sign and a message board sign. Some schools have more. Sunset High School has an electronic reader board adjacent to Cornell Road. The differences are due to the setup and the environment of the perspective school grounds. Westview High School has a very large expanse of green space that surrounds the high school. It prominently sits on 185<sup>th</sup> and is easily recognizable. Aloha and Sunset High Schools, like Southridge, are located in a visually congested corridor. The schools' entrances and access points fight with the surroundings to make sure that people understand what is going on there. Schools in this community are multi-purpose facilities. The Southridge school grounds are shared with Tualatin Hills Aquatic Center, which opened recently with its own signage and its own activity areas, and there will be a variety of other public uses that takes place on that site. At the high schools, tennis courts are available for public play. There are athletic fields used for a variety of organized and casual sports. There is a lot of activity that takes place on high school grounds because they are fairly extensive areas. The sign package presented for Southridge was designed to address a number of factors that dictate what signage should be for a high school of this size. Southridge is a Grade 9 through 12 school. It's estimated capacity at full utilization will be approximately 1800+ students. One of the features that takes place at Southridge that is different from the other schools is their commitment to community facilities including law enforcement and community use of the media center. It has taken the step of integrating the community into the school to a greater degree than what has occurred at the other high schools.

Mr. Orchard reviewed the reasons for the proposed signage package. One of the major factors is safety. High schools attract a large number of visitors. Visitors arrive by a variety of means. Six of the nine months that school is in session is during a time of less than optimal lighting conditions for activities that take place after school and in the evening hours. Signage is designed to provide markers to guide people, particularly bus drivers, into the appropriate areas. In the case of this particular high school, there is a middle school located in the immediate vicinity and there is an aquatic center located on the school grounds. In order to orient people to where they need to go, there needs to be signs of sufficient height and size. The turning movements of buses are critical. Buses cannot turn on a dime. Bus drivers need to have appropriate benchmarks so they can see where they need to be locating their marks to turn into school grounds. It is not only a safety issue but also a congestion issue. Another factor is the ability to guide people to where they need to go and for school security, it is necessary to identify the main entrance to the school building. Visitors need to go through the main entrance. People need to understand where the front door is. The directional function of signage is

important. Another factor is aesthetics. It is inconceivable that one would develop a multi-building campus, a high school that sits with an aquatic center on about 40 acres of property, and not have signs that are commensurate with the overall size and character of the building. We all have public expectancy of public buildings. We look for signs to get us to places where we want to be. The public's desire to understand what school events are taking place, which would be on the message board, how they get to them, what part of the school is being used for those events is not only extremely important for directional value but is something we all expect. There is an element at the high school level he would term development of school pride or sense of school community. The logo sign is very much keyed to starting the school and reinforcing at this school a pride in the school. The school logo was selected by the incoming students. This is a commonly used feature with other high schools in the area. It is there because it is an external comment on who the people are who are in the building on a regular basis. If this school is opened without a sign package that is roughly similar to other high schools in the Beaverton and Portland area, and even similar to elementary schools, it creates a negative in terms of what this school is all about and the thought that has gone into its design. It seems odd to be able to place a monument sign but not be able to place a sign over the main entry. This is common among all elementary schools.

Mr. Orchard stated that the main issue in the staff report is the critique under Criterion 2 as to why the variance cannot be approved. It states that strict interpretation of the ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights enjoyed by other properties in the same district, which in this case is the R-7 zone. Looking at the staff report for the athletic field scoreboard, the comparative is not the rights enjoyed by other people in the R-7 district, it is the rights enjoyed throughout the comprehensive high school community, including reference to a non-public high school in Beaverton, Jesuit. Criterion 2 has been met. In analyzing Criterion 2, one must take this large expanse that is devoted to the high school campus and essentially increase the size of the surrounding neighborhood to the same size. If you had a multi-building residential use that receives sometimes hundreds of thousands of visitors on a regular basis with the kind of traffic levels that will be generated by the high school on a regular basis, it would be concluded that in the R-7 District, those residential uses would have the need for the same kind of signage. They are not looking at what is commensurate to what is happening in the R-7 District but rather have said that residential uses in the R-7 District do not have the need for this type of signage. If the residential uses had this kind of activity and this level of usage and traffic and the need for safety, the need for dealing with a specialized population, namely students, they would have the need for the proposed signage. The residential uses can get by with a house number and maybe a number on the curb. They do not have to contend with buses, or at a minimum, a couple thousand people daily roughly 180 days a year for their daily activity. These signs are commensurate with the activity that takes place on this property. To say that since a single family residence does not have it, then a high school should not have it is not an equal comparison. Another factor is that this is a public building and receives widespread public use. The

City Hall has a very large lettered wall mounted City Hall sign sitting on the face of this building and there is a monument sign as one enters the parking lot. This high school would not even be allowed to have similar signage under the current staff recommendation.

With regard to the logo sign, Mr. Orchard indicated they do not understand why Criterion 1 is not satisfied. It appears it is a question of size. One of the most heavily used activity areas by the public is the gymnasium. When visiting an unfamiliar school, it is always a challenge to determine which tall building is the outside of the gymnasium. The logo not only serves as a visual reminder of the school pride and sense of community, but also identifies the location of the gym. There are a couple schools that do not have logos on or adjacent to their gymnasium and it is a continued source of complaint. In the cases of schools that have logos, bus drivers know exactly to go, as do students and athletes from other schools.

MARK SIEMIENIEC, Dull Olson Weekes, 319 SW Washington, Suite 200, Portland 97204, Project Architect, described the message board. The size of the sign was selected based on the type of verbiage that will be placed on the sign. They want the flexibility to use various sizes of lettering. This is the reason for the number of lines and size of the reader board itself. With regard to the logo sign on the gymnasium, there was question as to why the sign should be so large. The location of this large building is adjacent to the aquatic center. There is a definite desire to provide some type of visual separation to identify the gymnasium with Southridge. Driving down the street, it appears as all one facility. The building entry sign lettering will be cast aluminum with a clear anodized finish. The back side of the scoreboard will be whatever the manufacturer of the sign provides. Typically they are a painted black background or are galvanized finish. They also have the issue of the flagpole that they want to assure is approved. It was included in their application but no mention was made by staff of its approval.

JAMES LYNCH, Beaverton School District, 16550 SW Merlo Road, Beaverton 97006, Facilities Administrator, stated that Mr. Orchard and Mr. Siemieniec have pointed out very well why they have proposed the signs, their size and scale, and their location. The scale of each of the signs has been very appropriately selected by the architect in their proposal. Looking at the scale of the outside of the school building, one will get a sense of the scale of those signs relative to the building that they are mounted to. This is a 250,000 square foot building. This is probably a minimum of 25 times larger than the average non-residential building located in an R7 zone that would also be requesting some type of signage permit. This is an enormous facility and the scale of these signs on this facility are very appropriate. Another point is the viewing distance. This buildings sits back roughly 180 feet away from the street. Most properties in the R-7 zone are only half that size in depth. To be able to appropriately read from a distance, those signs must be larger than normal. They understand that the ordinance cannot

envision every application and every situation that will come before the City and that is why there is a variance procedure. He does not believe that the variance procedure is one that is created to develop and support the strict guidelines of the ordinance, but rather to create a mechanism to accept something that is different than the strict guidelines of the ordinance for good supportable reasons. These requests fit that criteria. The message sign is a large sign. There are street trees planted along 125<sup>th</sup> in compliance with City Code. There is landscaping that separates the street from the sidewalk and the sidewalk from the parking lot. The easterly parking lot separates all that from the building. With the traffic volume and the street trees, it is going to take a relatively good size sign to communicate a message of importance to the community. With regard to the number of lines on the sign, Mr. Lynch averaged that each of the high schools has at least two events every day that the public is allowed to participate in. In order to communicate those current events, there needs to be enough room to list each of them on a sign without them visually conflicting.

Mr. Lynch clarified a statement made by Mr. Orchard with regard to bus drivers. There are many bus drivers who have never been to Southridge High School. All the events that are held at a high school draw participants from other high schools. Those bus drivers are not familiar with Southridge and they must have visual queues to know where to turn as they approach the site. Buses need adequate time to plan their turns. They have made a significant effort, on the part of the School District, over the last two years to involve the community in the design of this facility. Approximately 18 meetings have been held with the community at large or with specific groups in order to work out issues and address and resolve concerns. As can be seen, the Council Chambers is not packed with opponents to this proposal and yet it is a significant proposal. The community does not seem to be backing staff's recommendation. The signage package was presented at their last neighborhood meeting and there was no opposition expressed. They were in fact supportive of the signage. This appears to be the community's response to very appropriately designed signage and he asked that the Board support the School District's request for approval of these signs.

Mr. Straus said during his tenure on the Board, he has had difficulty with the Sign Ordinance. There are a lot of things that do not make sense. Unfortunately, there has not been time over the last 13 years to decide what should be done and what would make sense. However, it is the ordinance that the Board is working under. Mr. Straus cited examples of past instances such as signage for shopping centers which did not take into account factors such as the level of activity on site, the speed of traffic, safety issues, etc. It was simply a matter of eliminating visual pollution. A lot of people made very strong cases as to why their particular sign should be allowed even though the Code did not allow it. He asked what makes the School District's situation unique and why it should have any greater right or entitlement to consideration for its signs than a commercial development that has very similar needs for visibility and safety.

Mr. Orchard said these are public buildings that deal with a specialized population on a regular basis. There is a large segment of that population that is transported to that location. The student body does not have the choice of not going to school. That is where they belong during the school year. This is a defined population that needs to be there. Compared to a retail or commercial center, other than the employees, it is the choice of the patrons to visit the site or not. There are unique issues of public safety. There are unique issues of the access to a public building. In the event of an injury at an athletic event, the emergency response people need to know exactly where to go. A matter of seconds in the case of emergencies can be critical. You want people to know where the gymnasium is. You want people to know which building is Conestoga Middle School, which is the Aquatic Center, and which is the high school and which building on the high school campus is the building they need to go to. This is a greater need than what occurs in a multi-building office park. Looking at a typical office park signage, the square footage is significantly greater than what is proposed for the high school. In an office park, each individual business is allowed a sign, each building gets a sign, each address gets a sign, each directory that sits as a monument sign has its own location. In this case, there is a specialized population that needs to be there on a daily basis, the public is invited and asked to come to activities. There is a higher level of concern about the issues of signage. If one builds a public building, there is a commitment to the public to build it right. Not only do you sign it in a way that people know where they need to go but you do it in an aesthetic fashion so that the building looks like it is presentable to the public and is a wise and intelligent use of expenditure. If the Board accepts staff recommendation, there will be more signage at Rock Creek Elementary School than there will be at Southridge High School. There will not even be a sign over the front door. The Sign Code does not fit and it will become more of a problem as properties are annexed because there will be grandfathered situations. The comparative used for the athletic field scoreboard is that allowed at other high schools. This was not the case with the other three signs. This is a public building, open to the public approximately 18 hours a day at least 5 days a week.

Ms. Crane asked how many lines on the message board will actually be used for lettering. She expressed concern with the potential for distraction for young drivers if the reader board is filled with messages. Mr. Siemieniec said they were looking for flexibility. The multiple lines allow for a varying size of letter fonts. How much text will be placed will be up to the school. Mr. Orchard added that if a traffic hazard is created, this would be dealt with. Sunset High School with the electronic readerboard has not posed a traffic safety problem. If there are traffic accidents in front of the school, the Police Department will bring it to their attention to address the cause.

Chairman Cannon said she noticed the street trees are of a size that they will block the signage very soon. Mr. Lynch explained that the trees have been removed as of yesterday. One of the City's requirements was that they expand the width of the street by two feet and to do that, the trees had to be removed. They will plant new trees that

will have open trunks with a canopy beyond the height of the proposed sign. Mr. Siemieniec discussed the alternative sign locations, noting that one is on top of the monument sign which is located away from the street trees. Discussion ensued on the three possible locations for the sign and the benefits of each. Mr. Straus reminded the applicant that the Ordinance allows small directional signs at the entrances. His preference for the message board sign would be on top of the monument sign at the center location.

RAMONA CROCKER, 11765 SW Wilkens Lane, Beaverton 97008, noted that the applicant had stated that the lack of organized opposition indicates general support for the sign variances. She disagreed in that she is a resident of the neighborhood and was unaware of the variance requests until two weeks ago when she attended the last Design Review meeting on an unrelated manner. It is not a case of her not reading the paper or not being aware of what is going on in Beaverton. She opposes the oversized pole-mounted message board on the grounds of aesthetics and public safety. With the increased traffic and congestion that we are going to be having on 125<sup>th</sup>, drivers do not need the added distraction of a large multi-lined message board. Proposed large oversized signs such as the marquee sign gives a feeling of commercial atmosphere to this residential neighborhood. She does not feel that the applicant has met the criteria. With regard to Criterion 2, as was pointed out earlier, the amount of signage varies among the schools. Conestoga Middle School has a monument type sign which includes a couple lines of changeable type. It is informative but is not obtrusive and it blends in well with the structure. Something of that nature would be appropriate for the high school. The high school is coming into a neighborhood of residences and if the applicant wishes to be a good neighbor, it is going to have to allow for the fact that this is a residential neighborhood. Criterion 3 has not been met. Special conditions and circumstances do result from the applicant's choice of where they chose to site the building adjacent to the aquatic center. They could have sited the building in some other manner but they chose to put it very near the swim center so they created the situation of confusion, if there is one. She feels that Criterion 4 has not been met with regard to the aesthetics of the area and it's detriment to public safety with this large oversized reader board. Criterion 5 – five signs is not the minimum variance that would permit reasonable use of the buildings. She feels that Criterion 6 has not been met in that the request for the variances is for the convenience of the applicant. The applicant argued that they must have this large oversized sign so that people know what is going on at the school. There are other means of communication with the community than the marquee sign board. The middle school puts out a newsletter to the neighborhood and the school patrons and she is sure that Southridge High School will do the same. This is definitely a means of knowing what is going on at the school as well as coverage of events in the Valley Times. She is also opposed to the painted logo. She finds it objectionable and that it too would take away from the general atmosphere of the neighborhood. She does not oppose the sign over the entrance if done in good taste nor does she oppose the monument-type sign that is within Code.



DAN MAKS, 14080 SW Steeplechase Court, Beaverton 97008, speaking on behalf of himself and the Southridge Local School Committee, said although this is a new high school, he has a long history with the school. In 1996 he was Chairman of the Citizens of School Support and lead the campaign for passage and construction of this school and others in the Beaverton School District. He was Chairman of the Planning Commission when it came forward for the Conditional Use Permit. In March he was elected to the Local School Committee for Southridge. The community approved this school. They approved it because they believe in education. They believe in the Beaverton School District and its projects and they believed that this would be a community asset. From the very beginning, this school was designed and is being constructed as such. It has two community rooms. It has a specific area designed for a police substation. There is talk about leaving the library open to the general public for reference and research in agreement with the new City of Beaverton library. This is not just a standard educational facility. It is not a standard comprehensive high school. It is a community asset. It is a community meeting place. It is a community resource. Therefore, we have to identify it as such. We do need a reader board and we need one that is of adequate size. A high school is a busy place and this one is going to be even busier because of the community input, the way it is designed, and the way it is being built. We need to know what is happening inside of it and what is available inside of it. We need a Southridge sign with a mascot and something large enough in scale to be visible. We want the students to identify and feel good about the school more so than the 7-11 across the street. The mascot, school name, and school identify are very important to students this age. The Board has discretion and he asked that the Board approve these variances. The common thread of denial here is Criterion 2 and it is too strict of an interpretation. Based on his experience in Code Review, he finds that the Code does not fit all occasions and all instances, especially this one. This is the first high school being built in the City of Beaverton in almost 100 years. This is a unique land use and is also a unique high school. The comparisons are very difficult. Home occupations are allowed a sign of 2 square feet in size. Signage for five homes per acre on this 33 acres would result in 165 homes and that times 2 square feet per each sign would total 330 square feet. Under a Conditional Use Permit in an R-7 zone, uses such as hospitals, colleges, universities, churches, City Hall, all the way down to nursery schools are allowed. It is obvious that the signage needs for a nursery school are completely different than those for a 204,000 square foot comprehensive high school. The applications meet the criteria to avoid visual chaos and to reduce the level of confusion. The intent of the Comprehensive Plan was to avoid visual blight. This application provides less signage than if six Conditional Use Permits were approved along 125<sup>th</sup>. These do not produce visual blight. Therefore they are appropriate. He asked that the Board approve a reader board of adequate size, a sign with a mascot of appropriate scale to the wall on which it is being placed, and allow that lettering be placed above the entry door. Let this school have its identity, enhance its ability to serve the community, and let it be recognized as the asset that it is in the City of Beaverton.

GREG GUTHRIE, 10470 SW Citation Drive, Beaverton 97008, said from its conception, Southridge was designed not only to be a community-encompassing environment that invites the community in to participate in the education process but to give south Beaverton for the first time a central point of focus. This is essentially a residential community. The only identifiable signage is a bright orange 7-11 sign and storage facility across the street. It is critical to identify the site. Considering the number of athletic events, the drama events, and the community events planned at the school, the immediate form of communication is necessary. Mailings are very expensive to keep the community informed on a weekly basis of everything going on in that building. Most people do not read the newspaper. Most people do not read the mailings that come to their homes. Mailings have a limited application when you truly want to communicate with individuals. Welcoming the public into the facility creates a security issue. Identification and being able to channel the public into the building at the appropriate place is crucial in maintaining not only a sense of community, but a sense of security so that it can be monitored. This is a unique use. It is unique in the context of south Beaverton. There is no other facility or opportunity, and probably won't be in the future, to provide a single facility that provides the opportunity for this multitude of uses. As such, in helping create that sense of community and focus for the people of south Beaverton, it is critical to identify a landmark. This is a landmark. The neighbors need to understand and feel an ownership in this building. He believes signage is one way to help accomplish that.

GEORGE FISHER, 14165 SW Stirrup Place, Beaverton 97008, said he understands the restrictions the rules place on both people for and against sign issues. There is a growing sense of community in the south Beaverton area. At the time he moved to his current home 9 years ago, there was no development on the west side of Murray Boulevard. Murrayhill did not exist. People then were more identifiable with the Beaverton High School because that is where everybody went. He is excited to be a part of the south Beaverton community and an active participant in the activities at Southridge High School. He expressed support for the message board. Most people travel by cars. Many of us are parents of students who attend various activities at the school. There is a lot more going on at the school than the sport and academic activities. The signage board has the potential for providing an information focus for the Southridge High School community. It will provide information to the parents and to the community of what is going on. He feels the more information, the better and the bigger the sign, the better, taking into account the safety and aesthetic issues. In order for Southridge High School to fulfil it's mandate, it must get the information to the community.

#### Rebuttal Testimony

Mr. Orchard stated that middle schools do not have interscholastic activities and do not have formalized drama or music programs. High schools have a tremendous amount of students involved in those activities. The need for a reader board is most acute at the high school level because of the number of variety of activities that take place at the school. With regard to the proximity of the aquatic center to the school buildings, with the required access to the high school off 125<sup>th</sup>, it essentially dictates the layout of the school site. To say that there was a choice made to create side by side facilities, this type of arrangement exists at many of the Beaverton schools. The number one project of every school that does not have a message board is to raise money for one. It is a highly desired amenity for the local school community for the reasons Mr. Maks, Mr. Guthrie, and Mr. Fisher just discussed. It is a quick, efficient, and much desired way to communicate what is going on at the school. There appears to be no dispute over the need for the school name over the front entrance. The marquee-type sign is normal for schools in almost every community.

Mr. Straus asked Mr. Osterberg if the painted logo sign on the building is a problem because it faces 125<sup>th</sup> or because it is visible from 125<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Osterberg said neither is very important in staff findings. The primary issue with the logo sign is the size. Staff made a finding that there was not an adequate reason as to why the sign needed to be so large. The applicant provided some testimony this evening as to why it needs to be so large. It is up to the Board to determine what size it should actually be.

Mr. Straus said two of the options for the pole mounted sign would include space on the sign for identification of the school. If the sign is used in conjunction with the monument sign which already says Southridge High School, the size of the sign could be reduced to eliminate that identification. Looking at the elevation of the sign, the reader board overwhelms the rest of the sign to a point that it does not look right. He asked what reduction could be made and still accomplish the same objectives. Mr. Siemieniec said the text on the reader board for the school name could be reduced. As a design element, they were looking to be able to maximize signage and the ability to put different proportions of sign text into the sign itself. Mr. Straus felt there may be some opportunity to resize or reportion the reader board part of the sign if placed on the monument sign. If the monument is the preferred location, the Board can condition that it be done at a different size than shown. It seems awkward as proposed. A modified size would have a more pleasing and integrated look. Mr. Siemieniec said they would entertain a change in the proportion of the sign. The intent is to be able to have something that is pleasing that would be comparable to the wall it is sitting on and acceptable in terms of the design of the wall itself. Mr. Orchard spoke in regard to the redundancy of the name. The preferred height of the marquee sign is headed by the name of the school or at least its initials and done in school colors. It is that kind of landmark that people notice. Having Southridge High School on the monument is appropriate but is not a substitution for also including it on the marquee sign. If the actual text field is out of scale, then that can be modified. Mr. Lynch added that if the

proportion, by the Board's determination, is something they would prefer to see changed, he suggested that a different proportion be suggested or required rather than defining specific dimensions. There are other alternatives through design of proportional aspects than simply reducing something that, as a result of the reduction, may result in a less desirable communicating device.

Chairman Cannon asked if the reader board signs are purchased in a standard size or are custom-sized. Mr. Siemieniec said they are purchased custom-sized.

The public portion of the hearing was closed.

RECESS: 9:00 p.m.

RECONVENE: 9:07 p.m.

Ms. Crane said her only concern is the size of the reader board because of the safety issue. The message boards at other schools are a little smaller. The signs are good for a sense of community.

Chairman Cannon said at the time the Conditional Use Permit was issued, it changed the requirements. This became a conditional use so you need to maximize the use which has been authorized. If schools are not identified well, you do not maximize the use they are intended for. There is a current tendency in society for disconnection. Anything that can be done to make a connection to the community is worthwhile. She has sympathy for the concern of visual clutter but she thinks a school needs to have information for the community which the reader board provides. The logo gives the students spirit. A 32-square foot logo would appear as a blob on the huge building. The logo has to be in proportion to the building. She supports the idea of what the applicant has asked for. She is not concerned with the size of the reader board. If other Board members feel the proportion is not good, she will defer to their sense of proportion. She likes the idea of the sign being located in the middle of the site. Located at the driveway would seem to make it clearer.

Mr. Straus reiterated that the Sign Ordinance has been a thorn in his side and that of the Board for many years. This is a fine example of the failings of that ordinance. He thinks it was important to address those issues in the context of the ordinance but sometimes the ordinance has to give way to reason and propriety. With regard to the message board, his feeling is that it should be located with the monument sign at the center of the site and that it should be reduced in height but allowed to be increased in width to allow it to retain the same square footage. The height seems to be out of proportion to the base on which it is being set. It will also give greater flexibility for longer statements rather than having to do multi-lines that may be more difficult for passers-by to read while traveling down 125<sup>th</sup>. With regard to the logo, it is a natural thing to do. It is a unique situation because of the nature of the building on which it is being placed. It

needs to be addressed in that context. The proportion of the signage is appropriate for the surface on which it is being located and he does not have an objection to it. The main entry sign is appropriate as is the score board which he feels should be removed from consideration as signage and be dealt with as a piece of equipment, the same as any other equipment that would go into a school.

Mr. Straus asked if the flagpole is under consideration tonight. Mr. Osterberg said it is not. The flagpole is already allowed by Code. He had asked the applicant to include the information so the Board could see the full spectrum of the elements being added to the site. Flags and flagpoles are described in the sign chapter. There is no variance needed for the flagpole.

Mr. Straus MOVED and Ms. Crane SECONDED a motion for approval of VAR 99-00011 Southridge High School Sign Variance, Sign 1 Message Board, based upon the testimony, reports, and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter with the following condition:

The message board shall be located on top of the monument sign. The overall height of the combined monument and reader board shall not exceed 9 feet. The area of the reader board shall not exceed 80 square feet.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Straus MOVED and Ms. Crane SECONDED a motion for approval of VAR 99-00013 Southridge High School Sign Variance, Sign 3 Painted Logo Wall Sign, as designed, based upon the testimony, reports, and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Straus MOVED and Ms. Crane SECONDED a motion for approval of VAR 99-00014 Southridge High School Sign Variance, Sign 4 Main Entry Wall Sign, as presented, based upon the testimony, reports, and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Straus MOVED and Ms. Crane SECONDED a motion for approval of VAR 99-00015 Southridge High School Sign Variance; Sign 5 Athletic Field Scoreboard, based upon the testimony, reports, and exhibits presented at the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings, and conclusions found in the staff report dated June 10, 1999, including Condition 1.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. BDR 99075 – NEW BEAVERTON LIBRARY PARKING**

Request for a Design Review approval to construct a parking lot for the new City library. The proposed lot is west of the new library on property encompassed by SW Hall Boulevard, SW Washington Street, SW Third Street, and SW Fifth Street. The site is within the Town Center (TC) and Residential Multi-Family Urban High Density (R-1) zone. Map 1S1-15BC; Tax Lots 8200, 8300, 8400, 850, 8600, 8700, and 8800.

Mr. Osterberg presented the staff report. He had distributed a Memorandum that contained an update of the Planning Commission action at their hearing for the Conditional Use Permit and a modification of Design Review Condition 11.

LINDA ADLARD, Chief of Staff, City of Beaverton, 4755 SW Griffith Drive, Beaverton 97076, reviewed the history of this project. A couple years ago they came to the Planning Commission and to the Board of Design asking for a very large variance request for a reduction in parking. The Commission denied that request. Since that time, the City has looked at every option possible to provide parking for this new library. The end result is that the City has purchased the entire block west of Hall and between Third and Fifth Streets and Washington. It was a very expensive purchase considering the purchase of the land, purchase and removal of the homes, and the paving of the parking lot. It is the desire of this City to protect its neighborhoods through adequate parking so citizens using the facility do not overflow into the neighborhoods. The issues raised by the Planning Commission were few but are important. With regard to the oak tree, they are hoping to be able to retain it. The real issue is whether or not the sidewalk can be designed without having much of a curve in it. A curved sidewalk would pose a hazard to sight impaired people who would be channeled towards Hall. This is an extremely dangerous situation. They will have to review this matter and determine whether the tree is fully within the landscaped area and whether or not it will be affected by the sidewalk. There is going to be a great deal of disruption in this area because they will have to underground the utilities. They do not know whether the tree can be saved or not. They would like the flexibility to save it if they can. The issue of the parking islands, that they are 6-1/2 feet versus 8 feet is that they would lose 4 parking spaces. They and staff feel that providing four parking spaces for the citizens is more important than having larger islands with more barkdust. They ask that the 6-1/2-foot wide parking islands be allowed.

Mr. Straus questioned how the southern boundary of the parking lot was established. Ms. Adlard said the southern boundary conforms with the vision of having a greenway in front of the library through the next block and connecting to the City park to provide a pedestrian area and to try to preserve openness and park-type area for the citizens to use. At the neighborhood meeting, the suggestion of pushing parking into the park area was discussed. Conceptually, it works but it does not work from a design standard. It is the belief of this administration that green spaces in a downtown area are very important. This will be a beautiful building. It will be very open. Mr. Straus confirmed

that we are giving up some of the width of the landscaped islands in the parking lot in order to preserve the integrity of the open area which is also a landscaped area to the south. Ms. Adlard said this is correct. The City is committed to putting extensive landscaping into the public park area. They intend to make the islands look good but they also intend to insure that the park has more than enough plantings to make it very lovely. Mr. Straus said he was curious as to why the parking lot could not be shifted three feet in order to provide the standard landscaped island width.

DAVID SHELMAN, Thomas Hacker & Associates, 34 NW First Avenue, Suite 406, Portland 97209, said the park open space is designed to tie the three blocks together. Moving across the front of the library area there are pedestrian areas. There is an area that contains a set of marching trees that will be continued in some form across Hall to Washington and into the existing City park. The southern boundary of the parking lot was established by the design intent to tie the three blocks together with landscaping and a walking surface. Their landscape architect felt that 6-1/2 feet for the landscaped islands would be sufficient in order to achieve the required number of parking spaces.

Mr. Straus questioned what affect the narrower landscaped islands will have on the type of trees that can be planted. Mr. Shelman said there are two goals in the parking lot. One is to have sufficient landscaping to make it a reasonable and pleasant place to come into and the second is to keep it as open as possible and easy to maintain. The choice of trees in the islands was something they worked through with staff and at staff's recommendation, they chose a columnar tree that would not block the light from the light fixtures. The width of the islands will not affect the trees as much as it might affect the shrubbery and groundcover.

Mr. Straus brought up the item the Planning Commission raised in their meeting with regard to pedestrian safety. He asked if they have come up with a manner in which to address this. Ms. Adlard said there will be lots of children who will come to this library. It is a concern that there be safe access for the citizens. It is unfortunate that the parking lot had to be located across a busy street. One of the suggestions had been that they place a pedestrian-activated light in the vicinity of Fourth Street. She is not certain whether that would be feasible. It may pose a problem for vehicles traveling through a green light at Fifth to encounter a pedestrian crossing so soon. This may be a feasible option if the two lights are linked in that pedestrians will not get a green light to cross at Fourth when traffic has a green light at Fifth. People will be directed towards Fifth because that is the location of the entrance to the library. They may either have to place barriers or very seriously enforce jaywalking until people understand they cannot cut across the street. Mr. Straus commented that the "marching of trees" as described earlier creates a setting for crossing the street at that point. This attracts a creative nuisance. He felt that the signals could be coordinated but did not think there are any devices that will prevent people from taking the shortest route possible to the entrance unless it is contradictory or unattractive to the open space that is being created. Ms.

Adlard said the Farmer's Market currently operates in this area and it draws thousands of people. The issue of crossing Hall has not been a problem. The City's traffic engineers have looked at this. The consultants have looked at this. They are all aware of the problem. She would not want to compromise the design of a very lovely area because people will not obey the law. We have to find a way to educate the citizens and their children to not break the law by jaywalking and to use an access that is appropriate and safe.

Mr. Straus noted that the Planning Commission made a recommendation and the Board may want to do the same by recommending that the pedestrian flow across Hall be dealt with in conjunction with the design of the park.

Mr. Osterberg wished to address the Board's question as to whether the trees proposed for the landscaped islands were appropriate for the 6-1/2 foot width. He checked with Steven Brennan, the City's street tree landscape foreman, and he determined that the Bowhall maple is an appropriate tree for a narrower width planter area.

The public portion of the hearing was closed.

Mr. Straus MOVED and Ms. Cannon SECONDED a motion for approval of BDR 99075 New Beaverton Library; West Parking Lot based upon the testimony, reports, and exhibits presented at the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings, and conclusions found in the staff report dated June 24, 1999, with Conditions 1 through 14 with the following modification and recommendation:

Condition 11 – Delete the last three sentences of Facilities Review Condition C.2.

The Board recommends that the design of the adjacent park to the south include traffic control devices to facilitate crossing Hall Boulevard at approximately the Fourth Street location.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Lemon resumed the duties as Chairman.

**B. BDR 99037/VAR 99007/VAR 99008 – TREND BUILDING**

Request for approval to remove the existing DEQ facility, located at 11170 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Street, and to construct a building for warehouse, wholesale, and light industrial use. The proposed building will be approximately 17,000 square feet in size, with associated parking and landscaping. In addition, the applicant requests approval to reduce the building's front yard setback from the required 35-foot minimum to 10 feet. The applicant also requests approval to reduce the parking lot front yard setback from the required 20-foot minimum to 10 feet. The site is within the Industrial Park (IP) zone. The site is located east of Highway 217, south of SW 5<sup>th</sup> Street, north of Southern



Pacific Railroad, and is approximately 1.53 acres in size. Map 1S1-15DA; Tax Lots 1500 and 1600.

Mr. Cooper presented the staff report indicating that staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Chairman Lemon questioned whether there was mitigation required for the wetlands. Mr. Cooper said the applicant is not actually removing the wetlands but is encroaching in some areas and expanding in others to average the buffer. They are actually enhancing the wetlands by removing invasive species and replacing with appropriate wetland plant species.

TOM WRIGHT, Group Mackenzie, P.O. Box 69039, Portland 97201, representing Trend Construction, said they agree with the conditions contained in the staff report. This is a difficult site to develop due to its triangular shape, wetlands, and floodplains.

JEFF REEVES, Group Mackenzie, P.O. Box 69039, Portland 97201, said one of the design challenges was the site and the location of the building that would accommodate an industrial use. The siting of this building called for moving the building closer to the street. This takes all the trucking activity away from the street and moves it to the back of the building and it also creates an interesting building for pedestrians along SW Fifth. He described the building size, materials, and function. He described a cross-section of a pedestrian scale of the building and how the building relates to the sidewalk on the street.

Chairman Lemon expressed concern with the sloping landscaped area in front of the building. He asked what will keep barkdust and rain from washing down onto the sidewalk and into the street. There is approximately a 2 to 3-foot elevation drop. Mr. Reeves said it is a one to five slope which is really not a very steep slope. The building is set back 10 feet. They are going up about 2 feet. He did not feel this will be an issue. If they need to, they can reduce the slope height because the footings for the building will go down about 2 feet. They can expose more of the building wall. Mr. Reeves said the intent was to elevate the landscaping to have a greater presence but they can adjust it if the Board feels it is appropriate.

The public portion of the hearing was closed.

Mr. Straus MOVED and Ms. Cannon SECONDED a motion for approval of BDR 99037 Trend Building based upon the testimony, reports, and exhibits presented at the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings, and conclusions found in the staff report dated June 24, 1999, with Conditions 1 through 20. The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Straus MOVED and Ms. Cannon SECONDED a motion for approval of VAR 99007 and VAR 99008 Trend Building based upon the testimony, reports, and exhibits presented at the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings, and conclusions found in the staff report dated June 24, 1999. The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

The Board discussed whether they will continue the last item on the agenda, given the late hour or continue the item to the next hearing. Mr. Straus MOVED to continue the meeting and hear the last item on the agenda. Ms. Crane SECONDED the motion. The question was called and the motion CARRIED 3-1: Straus, Crane, and Lemon voting AYE; Cannon voting NAY.

Ms. Cannon excused herself from the meeting at this time.

**C. BDR 99048 – HEARTHSTONE RETIREMENT CENTER**

Request for a Type 3 Design Review approval to construct a three-level care facility at the northeast corner of SW Scholls Ferry Road and SW Davies Road. The proposal includes a three-winged building accommodating Congregate Care, Assisted Living, and Special needs/Alzheimer's care facilities, along with a common area and separate courtyards. The site is within the Multi-Family District Urban Medium Density (2,000 square feet) R-2 zone, and is approximately 5.5 acres in size. Map 1S1-33BD; Tax Lot 300.

Mr. Cooper presented the staff report indicating that staff is recommending approval with conditions. The Planning Commission approved the Conditional Use Permit on June 23, 1999.

Chairman Lemon asked about the presence of a wetland on the site. Mr. Cooper said the Division of State Lands and the Army Corps of Engineers determined that it is a non-jurisdictional wetland and no mitigation is required. It basically became a wet area due to previous grading.

WALTER FRIESEN, Hearthstone at Murrayhill, 8590 SW Indian Hill Lane, Beaverton 97008, said they want to build something special for the senior citizens. He discussed the philosophy of Hearthstone and the fact that their current facility is full and there is a great need in the community for this type of facility. He introduced the architect, engineer, and landscape architect.

CHRIS PETERSON, LRS Architects, 1121 SW Salmon Street, Portland 97205, described the layout of the building and its siting. It includes congregate care, assisted living, and special needs/Alzheimer's care facilities. The three-story building was placed at the lowest elevation of the site to reduce its impact to the surrounding areas. He reviewed a cross section and indicated the height of the adjacent buildings and the setback to this proposal.

PAUL FRANK, LRS Architects, 1211 SW Salmon Street, Portland 97205, architect, said the design of this building is based on their facility on Hart. They used similar materials, similar massing, as well as a couple new elements to make this facility compatible with the surrounding area. He described the siding, roofing, building materials, etc., as well as building elements to break up the mass.

CHARLES ROSENFELD, 7785 W. Stark Street, Portland 97229, Landscape Architect, described the landscape plan. The streetscape on Davies reflects the plantings located on the other side of the street. At the south side of the site, they have reinforced the screening along Scholls Ferry Road for the benefit of the streetscape as well as for the benefit of the residents, both in contouring and then reinforcing the contours with enhanced planting, color, and evergreen hedging. There is also a pedestrian plaza required due to the reduced parking allowance applied for by the applicant. This plaza will include benches, a trash receptacle, and will provide direct access to the corner of Davies and Scholls Ferry Road and to the bus stop which is actually on the west side of Davies and Scholls Ferry Road. He described the courtyards and the water features proposed for each.

GERRY FRIESEN, 4088 Orchard Drive, Lake Oswego 97035, co-owner and engineer, explained that all on-site storm detention will be below grade. All of the sewer and water facilities are adequate. They are going to add a 12-inch waterline to complete a looping system to be in conformance with all the requirements of the City for water and sewer.

Chairman Lemon noted that the color board refers to the 3 and 4-1/2 inch vinyl siding. The Materials and Finishes form states that the exterior siding will be cement fiber lap. Mr. Friesen said they have modified their materials and will be using the cement fiber lap siding. Chairman Lemon asked if the colors shown on the color board for the vinyl siding will be the same. Mr. Peterson said the colors will match those shown on the color board. Chairman Lemon noted that on the Materials and Finishes form it includes garages and carports; however, he did not see them on the plans. Mr. Peterson pointed out an area where they had planned to place carports and garages but there was a setback problem so they have eliminated the carports and have moved the garages. Chairman Lemon asked for a description of where fencing will be placed. Mr. Peterson illustrated on the site plan where fencing will be placed in the area of the Alzheimer's courtyard. This is the only fencing proposed for the project. Chairman Lemon questioned the type of fencing. Mr. Peterson said they would prefer an option to choose either iron or wood. Chairman Lemon asked for details on the iron fence if that is chosen. Mr. Rosenfeld said they were considering black tube steel with vertical pickets at 4 to 6 inches on center. It is heavily landscaped in this area.

The public portion of the hearing was closed.

Mr. Straus MOVED and Ms. Crane SECONDED a motion for approval of BDR 99048 Hearthstone Retirement Center based upon the testimony, reports, and exhibits presented at the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings, and conclusions found in the staff report dated June 24, 1999, with Conditions 1 through 20 with the following additional conditions:

Condition 21 – Information noted on the color board regarding siding materials shall be modified to reflect description of materials and finishes in the staff report.

Condition 22 – The applicant shall have the option of placing either a steel fence with 6-inch on center tubular pickets and tubular rails or a cedar fence of the good neighbor variety in the area of the Alzheimer's courtyard.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Straus MOVED and Ms. Crane SECONDED a motion for approval of the Minutes for May 27, 1999. The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

The Minutes for May 13, 1999 could not be approved because there was not a quorum of Board members present at this meeting who were present at the May 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Minutes will be approved at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: 11:05 p.m.